

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. No claims have been amended and no claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

In the Office Action, claims 1-15 and 20-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Masenas (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,010) ("Masenas"). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over Masenas.

Masenas discloses an apparatus for compressing data in accordance with a Lempel-Ziv-type algorithm. A Lempel-Ziv (L-Z) algorithm compression engine is designed to receive a stream of data bytes, store the bytes in a history memory and compare each new byte to the stored bytes in order to detect repeated patterns of bytes so that the pattern of repetition can be used as a basis for reducing the amount of data that needs to be transmitted. If new data to be processed includes a string or sequence of two or more data bytes that have been processed before, then a token comprising a value length and a relative address of the previously processed data string will be generated. Since the new data, which includes such string of previously processed data bytes can be expressed using fewer bits of information than that contained in the data string itself, the data stream is effectively compressed. If the new data to be processed does not form part of a previous data string existing in memory, there can be no compression and the raw data must be transmitted as a raw token. See Masenas at col. 1, ll. 25-42.

Claim 1 recites generating a pointer identifying a block of data in a previous electronic message. First, Masenas does not disclose or suggest the compression of electronic messages. Moreover, Masenas does not disclose generating a pointer identifying a block of data in a previous electronic message. The L-Z algorithm compression engine receives a stream of data bytes, stores the bytes in a history memory and compare each newly received byte to the stored bytes in order to detect repeated patterns of bytes. Therefore, the

compression engine checks for data repetition within the same string of data, and does not identify a block of data in a previously received data string. Consequently, claim 1 is patentable over Masenas. Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and include additional limitations. Therefore, claims 2-10 are also patentable over Masenas.

Claim 11 recites message identification logic for identifying a previous electronic message which contains a block of data found in a new electronic message. Therefore, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 11 is also patentable over Masenas. Since claims 12-20 depend from claim 11 and include additional limitations, claims 12-20 are also patentable over Masenas.

Claim 21 recites replacing a block of data with a pointer to said block of data in said prior electronic messages. Accordingly, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 21 is also patentable over Masenas. Because claims 22-30 depend from claim 21 and include additional limitations, claims 22-30 are also patentable over Masenas.

Claims 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Masenas in view of EP 909,037 to Ishida et al. (“Ishida”). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over Masenas even in view of Ishida.

Ishida discloses a method by which a test pattern to supplied to an integrated circuit for testing can be efficiently compressed. See Ishida at Abstract. Nevertheless, Ishida does not disclose or suggest generating a pointer identifying a block of data in a previous electronic message. As described above, Masenas does not disclose or suggest generating a pointer identifying a block of data in a previous electronic message. Therefore, any combination of Masenas and Ishida would also not disclose or suggest generating a pointer identifying a block of data in a previous electronic message. Consequently, the present claims are patentable over Masenas in view of Ishida.

Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome, and that the claims as are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: May 6, 2003

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980